

To: Grevatt, Peter[Grevatt.Peter@epa.gov]
Cc: Clark, Becki[Clark.Beki@epa.gov]; Lopez-Carbo, Maria[Lopez-Carbo.Maria@epa.gov]; Travers, David[Travers.David@epa.gov]; Allgeier, Steve[Allgeier.Steve@epa.gov]
From: Burneson, Eric
Sent: Wed 2/5/2014 4:57:28 PM
Subject: RE: WV Chemical Spill - Update

I checked the data posted yesterday and did not see any new information on the MCHM levels at the WV AW treatment facility. However there is new data posted on PPH (one of the other chemicals stored in the Freedom Industries tanks) levels at the plant <http://www.dhsem.wv.gov/Pages/WV-American-Water-Emergency.aspx> that shows that PPH was not detected in the raw water sample collected an hour after the containment boom failure on Monday.

From: Grevatt, Peter
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 11:27 AM
To: Stoner, Nancy; Kopocis, Ken; Shapiro, Mike
Cc: Burneson, Eric; Clark, Becki; Lopez-Carbo, Maria
Subject: FW: WV Chemical Spill - Update

Eric Burneson shared this link in follow-up to our email exchange last night. We'll keep tracking this to see whether there was any change following the failure of the containment boom.

Here is a link to the MCHM monitoring of the WV American Water system as of Sunday.

<http://www.dhsem.wv.gov/Documents/MCHM%20Operational%20Sampling%20Results%20as%20of%20700PM%201%20February%202014%20Non%20Detect%2010ppb.pdf>

The samples in raw and finished water were all at a non detect level, however the failure of the containment boom did not happen until the next day.

From: Stanislaus, Mathy
Sent: Monday, February 03, 2014 10:31 PM
To: Stoner, Nancy; Grevatt, Peter; Shapiro, Mike
Cc: Kopocis, Ken; Burneson, Eric; Clark, Becki
Subject: Re: WV Chemical Spill - Update

Yes - I think we good for now. Thanks.

From: Stoner, Nancy
Sent: Monday, February 03, 2014 10:18:10 PM
To: Grevatt, Peter; Shapiro, Mike; Stanislaus, Mathy
Cc: Kopocis, Ken; Burneson, Eric; Clark, Becki
Subject: Re: WV Chemical Spill - Update

Did this answer your Q, Mathy? Seems like we might be missing one another.

From: Grevatt, Peter
Sent: Monday, February 03, 2014 7:59:56 PM
To: Stoner, Nancy; Shapiro, Mike
Cc: Kopocis, Ken; Burneson, Eric; Clark, Becki
Subject: Re: WV Chemical Spill - Update

Our understanding is that monitoring is continuing at West Virginia American water and if the MCHM levels rose as a result of the boom failure they would detect it in their raw water sampling. If so then we would want them take appropriate actions and also advise down stream systems if the levels were above the 1 ppm level. Those systems would then need to make a decision about resuming monitoring.

From: Stoner, Nancy
Sent: Monday, February 03, 2014 5:46:12 PM
To: Grevatt, Peter; Shapiro, Mike
Cc: Kopocis, Ken
Subject: Fw: WV Chemical Spill - Update

Looks like an OW Q to me

From: Stanislaus, Mathy
Sent: Monday, February 03, 2014 2:24:49 PM
To: Garvin, Shawn; Adm13McCarthy, Gina; Deputy Administrator; Keyes-Fleming, Gwendolyn; Feldt, Lisa; Ganesan, Arvin; Reynolds, Thomas; Johnson, Alisha; Stoner, Nancy; Vaught, Laura; Distefano, Nichole; Hull, George; Stanton, Larry; Breen, Barry; Giles-AA, Cynthia; Hedman, Susan; Meiburg, Stan; Fritz, Matthew; Garbow, Avi; Jones, Jim
Cc: Early, William; Hodgkiss, Kathy; Capacasa, Jon; Ryan, Daniel
Subject: Re: WV Chemical Spill - Update

One question we need to be prepared to answer is since we don't have complete source control and we don't have the results back from piping/outflows sampling - what's the response to whether we agree that water intake monitoring not occur by utilities ?

From: Garvin, Shawn

Sent: Monday, February 03, 2014 1:11:11 PM

To: Adm13McCarthy, Gina; Deputy Administrator; Keyes-Fleming, Gwendolyn; Stanislaus, Mathy; Feldt, Lisa; Ganesan, Arvin; Reynolds, Thomas; Johnson, Alisha; Stoner, Nancy; Vaught, Laura; Distefano, Nichole; Hull, George; Stanton, Larry; Breen, Barry; Giles-AA, Cynthia; Hedman, Susan; Meiburg, Stan; Fritz, Matthew; Garbow, Avi; Jones, Jim

Cc: Early, William; Hodgkiss, Kathy; Capacasa, Jon; Ryan, Daniel

Subject: Re: WV Chemical Spill - Update

Here is the most recent update I just received...

OSC reported that the facility continues to manage surface and ground water seeping from the Site. A large amount of water has been pumped the past day (more than 100,000 gallons). The excess water has been due to steady rainfall combined with ice melt caused by warmer weather.

The booms deployed around the impacted shoreline of the facility were ripped free at approximately 6:00 AM on February 3, 2014. The ice flow and high water flowing down the Elk River caused the release of the booms. The booms were contained and tied off on the southern end of the shoreline. Work is ongoing to redeploy booms around the impacted shoreline.

The facility's remediation consultant, CEC, completed developing the monitoring wells for groundwater sampling. The monitor wells are scheduled for sampling February 4 through February 5. CEC also will submit to WVDEP a design for lining the northern end of the interceptor trench.

EPA will be shipping two samples to the Region 3 lab in Fort Meade today. One sample is water from the excavated pipe in the interceptor trench and the other sample is from a seep on the impacted slope.

Utilities along the Ohio River are no longer checking for the MCHM. On Jan.20, the Evansville, IN, water utility at Mile 791 monitored for MCHM and was unable to detect it.